DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 451 312 UD 034 093

AUTHOR Wang, Margaret C.; Wong, Kenneth K.; Kim, Jeong-Ran

TITLE The Need for Developing Procedural Accountability in Title I Schoolwide Programs. Publication Series No. 2.

INSTITUTION Mid-Atlantic Lab. for Student Success, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1999-00-00
NOTE 50p.
AVAILABLE FROM Laboratory for Student Success, 1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19122-6091. Tel: 800-892-5550 (Toll Free).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Academic Standards; *Accountability; Educational Legislation; Educational Quality; Effective Schools Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; *Federal Aid; Federal Government; *Government Role; Government School Relationship; Poverty; School Districts; School Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

This paper recommends developing an infrastructure of federal support and federal assessment of student performance to ensure that schoolwide programs in high poverty neighborhoods are able to meet specific legislative goals. It argues for closer links between the federal government and school districts in helping schoolwide programs develop coherent instructional strategies. These federal initiatives constitute procedural accountability in Title I schoolwide policy. Procedural accountability is a way to measure the extent to which knowledge is used effectively to meet the legislative expectations of the Title I program. This paper synthesizes lessons learned from existing studies of Title I, reports preliminary findings from ongoing research on schoolwide programs, discusses implications for policy development, and proposes a vision of the federal government as a supportive partner in procedural accountability for Title I schoolwide programs. Research indicates that teachers and principals have a strong sense of accountability in effective schools, more effective schools are likely to meet Improving America's Schools Act requirements, and districtwide academic standards have an impact on schoolwide programs. Policy recommendations include: strengthen the accountability function of the district; build a knowledge base; and hold schools accountable for raising expectations for all students. (Contains 28 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

ED 451 312

The Need for Developing Procedural Accountability in Title I Schoolwide Programs

by
Margaret C. Wang, Laboratory for Student Success (LSS) at
Temple University Center for Research in
Human Development and Education
Kenneth K. Wong, University of Chicago, LSS
and Jeong-Ran Kim, LSS

1999
Publication Series No. 2

The research reported here is supported in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education through a contract to the Laboratory for Student Success (LSS) established at the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education (CHRDE). The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position of the supporting agencies, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD034093

The 1994 Improving America's School Act (IASA) has created a new accountability framework for Title I policy. This accountability framework has two central dimensions: flexibility and standards. First, by making it easier for Title I schools to adopt "schoolwide programs" (programs that provide activities and services to all students in the school, not just students eligible for Title I funds), the legislation gives schools with high concentrations of poverty more flexibility in allocating resources, selecting curriculum, and grouping students for instruction. Second, under the new legislation, schools are expected to use their Title I funding to help all children improve student performance.

To be sure, these legislative expectations—high standards for all children and the flexibility to achieve them—are bold and innovative. However, to ensure that schoolwide programs in high-poverty neighborhoods have the capacity to meet these legislative goals, we argue for the development of an infrastructure of federal support and federal assessment of student performance. We see the federal role evolving from that of a watchdog—primarily focused on regulatory compliance—to a more active, supportive partner—providing funding and technical assistance for professional development, for example, and moving toward a vision of monitoring that helps schools and districts identify their needs, exchange information about effective practices, and identify strategies for improvement.

Further, we argue for closer links between the federal government and school districts in helping schoolwide programs develop coherent instructional strategies. These federal initiatives constitute what we call "procedural accountability" in Title I schoolwide policy. We encourage Congress to consider this notion of procedural accountability in the 1999 reauthorization of Title I.

Our notion of procedural accountability is grounded in the concept of "procedural knowledge," the knowledge base developed from research and practice about what it takes to successfully implement the legislative expectations of the Title I program. Procedural

accountability is a way to measure the extent to which knowledge is used effectively to meet the legislative expectations of the Title I program.

The legislative expectations come from the 1994 Improving America's Schools Act (IASA). The major ones are:

- Every school should have a comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that is based on information on the performance of children in relation to state content and student performance standards.
- Schoolwide reform strategies should: a) provide opportunities for all children to meet the state's proficient and advanced levels of student performance; b) be based on effective means of improving student achievement; c) use effective instructional strategies, including an enriched and accelerated curriculum, increasing the amount and quality of learning time etc.; and d) address the needs of all children in the school.
- Instruction should be provided by highly qualified professional staff.
- Teachers and aides need professional development so they can enable all children in the schoolwide program to meet the state's student performance standards.
- Schools should have strategies to increase parental involvement, such as family literacy services.
- Schools should have strategies for assisting preschool children.
- Schools should include teachers in decisions regarding the use of assessments.
- Schools should ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering any of the state's standards during the school year will be provided with effective and timely additional assistance.

In this paper we will synthesize the lessons learned from existing studies of Title I, report preliminary findings from our ongoing research on schoolwide programs, discuss the implications

of these findings for policy development, and propose a new vision of the federal government as a supportive partner in our procedural accountability framework for Title I schoolwide programs.

For analytical purposes, we differentiate three phases in the evolving Title I policy over time. These are: 1965-1980's: Categorical nature of the program dominates service delivery; "pullouts" are a common strategy; 1988-1994: Schoolwide programs are implemented on an experimental basis; and 1994-present: Schoolwide programs are implemented more extensively in high-poverty schools.

These phases can be distinguished from each other in terms of:

- the extent of federal focus on regulatory compliance;
- the extent to which high-poverty schools can combine federal Title I funds with other federal funds and spend them on schoolwide programs focused on improving student achievement;
- the degree to which student performance is a major focus in evaluations of program effectiveness in high-poverty schools.

These three phases of service delivery overlap in implementation. For example, categorical dimensions of the old Title I/Chapter I, such as pullout programs, remain fairly prevalent today even in schools claiming to operate schoolwide programs. The federal role has also shifted toward a focus on holding schools and districts accountable for improving the performance of all students, including poor children.

Phase One: Categorical Arrangement Dominates Title I in the 1960s to 1980s

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) marked a significant turning point in the federal government's role in improving public schools and social conditions for the nation's children. The "Great Society" programs were designed to alleviate poverty, and in an

effort to achieve this goal, the federal government required local governments to try new approaches and reformulate the delivery of services in all anti-poverty programs. However, in an effort to ensure that local government used the money properly, Congress also imposed numerous, complicated guidelines on local schools. These regulations were intended to make certain that federal dollars directly benefited disadvantaged pupils.

In the case of Title I, extensive misuse of funds at the local level prompted the federal government to write even tighter regulations during the 1970s. Most notably, an NAACP Legal Defense Fund study conducted during the early years of Title I found that schools were using Title I money not specifically to help disadvantaged children but for "general school purposes; to initiate system-wide programs; to buy books and supplies for all school children in the system; to pay general overhead and operating expenses; [and] to meet new teacher contracts which call for higher salaries" (Martin & McClure, 1969). Consequently, throughout the 1970s, federal leaders in Congress and the executive branch felt the Title I program required an exceedingly well-defined set of rules and guidelines, but many state and local officials had difficulty meeting these strict guidelines, because of both the nature and the extensive number of regulations.

At that time, Title I regulations stipulated that districts:

- use federal funds only in the schools with the highest concentration of poor students;
- use federal dollars to supplement rather than replace local and state revenues in Title I schools (the 'supplement, not supplant' rule);
- allocate the same amount of local money to Title I schools as any other schools in the district. (the 'comparability' requirement);
- commit at least the same level of local resources as provided in previous years (the 'maintenance of effort' requirement).

Furthermore, during the 1970s and the early 1980s, Title I required schools and districts to establish advisory councils of parents of participating children. As was typical of federal categorical programs, only eligible students were allowed to receive the services supported with federal Title I dollars.

As expected, there was resistance at the local level to the targeting of federal funds for special-needs students. In a comparative study of four major federal education programs in four urban districts, Peterson, Rabe, and Wong (1986) found that during the 1970s and 1980s, local districts, to varying degrees, were tempted to divert funds from redistributive programs for disadvantaged students to use the money for other purposes, such as general operating expense, that benefit the entire school population.

In time, local schools and districts became more able to accommodate and adapt to federal Title I regulations. (Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1993). This shift from a period of conflict between the local and federal government to a period of regulatory accommodation has been facilitated by several factors. At the district and school level, there was a growing cadre of school administrators and teaching staff who understood and accepted Title I program objectives, and the expectation that services would be targeted on the poorest children. At the federal level, policymakers began to consider whether the combination of detailed regulations, strict audits, and time-consuming paperwork associated with federal evaluations were creating insurmountable barriers to program implementation. As a result of these and other developments, program identifications that transcended governmental boundaries and a commitment to a coordinated effort gradually emerged.

The pace of moving toward federal-local cooperation in the management of programs for special needs students, such as Title I, special education, and bilingual education students, is not uniform. There are significant variations across school districts (McLaughlin, 1990). Wong (1990) found that local reform in Title I services depends on the district's fiscal conditions, political

culture, and the autonomy of the teachers and administrators. More severe and prolonged conflict over local noncompliance with federal regulations is likely to be found in poor districts with a weak fiscal capacity, because they are more likely to divert federal Title I funds for other purposes and engage in political patronage in hiring. A combination of these fiscal and political circumstances hinder local reform toward redistributive goals. At the other end of the continuum, less conflict was found in districts with strong fiscal capacity, strong district leadership, and teacher commitment to federal policy objectives (McLaughlin, 1987; Elmore, 1980; McLaughlin & Berman, 1978). These local conditions facilitated the transformation from a period of local-federal conflict over noncompliance to one of local accommodation of federal regulations in Title I programs. This institutional process of adaptation (e.g. targeting resources to eligible students) is a necessary condition for instructional and academic improvement in disadvantaged schools.

As federal fiscal auditing requirements became more manageable for districts, improvements in teaching and learning for disadvantaged students emerged at the top of the national policy agenda. A broad consensus was emerging among policymakers and educators that the narrow categorical programs such as Title I had produced too few benefits (Wong & Wang, 1994; Wang & Reynolds, 1995). Public concerns with student performance are in part due to the increasing global economic competition and in part due to the dissemination of comprehensive assessments of our educational system, such as the National Assessment of Education Progress and the Third International Math and Science Study, which created a common yardstick for national and international comparisons of student performance. For example, in 1990 a major federally-funded study based on a national survey of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA), Chapter 1 district-level coordinators found that the coordinators ranked federal Chapter 1 funding requirements (the "supplement not supplant", maintenance of effort, and comparability provisions) as far less burdensome than Chapter 1 regulations affecting instructional practices.

They viewed federal regulations governing evaluation, needs assessment, and student selection as the three most burdensome areas of Chapter 1 regulations.

Schools receiving Title I funds often use pullout programs, removing children from their regular classroom for special instruction largely because pullout programs make it easier to meet federal accounting requirements because they can identify the specific students being served. A 1983 survey of district-level program coordinators found that 73 % of respondents used pullouts mainly to comply with the federal regulations. More often than not, pullout sessions offer inferior instruction and set low standards for participating students. "Only 18 % of district administrators who used a pullout design indicated they believed it was educationally superior to any other mode of delivery" (Millsap et. al. 1992). As Michael Kirst (1998) observed, the 1983 report "A Nation At Risk" renewed public concerns that Chapter 1 students did not have access to the same core academic curricula and coursework as other students in the general population. Indeed, in 1992, the Commission on Chapter 1 urged that the federal government redesign the program in a way that would encourage schools to adopt more comprehensive, less fragmented strategies for educating disadvantaged children. To paraphrase the Commission's central argument, federal policy should promote "good schools," not merely provide good programs.

Phase Two: Schoolwide Programs on an Experimental Basis from 1988 to 1994

To reduce fragmentation in Title I schools, in 1988 Congress adopted the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The new legislation required that schools coordinate Chapter 1 instruction with the regular instructional program, encourage parental involvement, eliminate the requirement that schools with high concentrations of poor children obtain matching funds in order to establish a schoolwide program, and direct districts to take steps to improve Title I programs deemed ineffective because of low student achievement.

To promote these reforms, Congress awarded each state a modest grant of $90,000, which amounted to about $2,000 per school district in the U.S.

Several national trends in classroom organization seemed to have emerged following the implementation of the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments. First, an increasing number of Chapter 1 schools were beginning to combine or replace pullout programs with an "in-class" strategy, in which eligible students received additional assistance within their regular classroom setting. Yet pullouts remain by far the most popular instructional arrangement for Title I programs. Between 1985 and 1990, one study found that "there has been almost a 50 % increase in the number of districts offering in-class instruction" (Millsap et. al. 1992).

Second, the Hawkins-Stafford amendments in 1988 allowed schools with 75 % or more of students living in poor families to establish schoolwide programs. This new flexibility seems to have encouraged the growth of schoolwide programs. In 1990, 1,362 operated schoolwide programs, up from just 621 schools the previous year. High-poverty schools were now permitted to use federal funds to reduce class size, develop staff training programs, encourage parent involvement, and recruit new professional support personnel such as counselors, librarians, and nurses. A review of the literature during this experimental phase suggested the following patterns of implementation.

Hiring of Additional Staff/Reduced Class Size

Title I funding at schools operating schoolwide programs has been frequently used to hire additional staff, reducing class sizes. Reduced class size was identified as a key component of schoolwide programs by principals in slightly more than half of schools operating schoolwide programs during the 1991-92 school year. Schools reported an average reduction in class size from 27 to 19 children. Hiring of additional staff was not limited to teachers, schools also hired

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

counselors, social workers, school-family coordinators, and schoolwide program coordinators. (Millsap, et al., 1993).

Staff Development

Principals reported that new staff development activities had been implemented, or existing ones significantly strengthened, in more than three-quarters of schools operating schoolwide programs. During the first years of implementation, a majority of districts reported that schools operating schoolwide programs offered a more hours of staff development and the staff development activities that included both Title I and non-Title I teachers, compared to staff development in regular Title I schools. Staff development activities in schools operating schoolwide programs have included: training in reading/language arts instruction, instruction for low achieving students, and mathematics instruction (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). According to principals' reports, a teacher at a school operating a schoolwide program received an average of 29 hours of staff development, six hours more than the average teacher in a Title I school without a schoolwide program (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993; Millsap, et al., 1993).

Shared Decision Making and Teacher Input

The schoolwide program option encourages increased teacher input into decisions affecting the school, emphasizing teacher input into decisions about assessments. According to principals' reports in one major urban school district, teachers only had a moderate level of input into school decisionmaking. (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993) The majority of teachers had some level of input into decisions about assigning students and teachers to classrooms, hiring staff, and selecting instructional materials or purchasing computer hardware. Teachers had the greatest input in the decisions about selecting materials or purchasing hardware but had the least input in decisions about teacher assignment and recruitment of new teachers. (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993). In-depth

case studies, however, suggested that a school's adoption of a schoolwide program tended to be accompanied by a high degree of teacher control and site-based management arrangements (Stringfield, et al., 1997).

Distinction of Title I Services from the Regular Program

A central component of schoolwide programs is the provision of Title I activities and services to all students in the school, not just students to receive Title I services eligible under poverty guidelines. One indicator of a schoolwide program's inclusiveness is the extent to which Title I services cannot be distinguished from services offered to all children (e.g., a school that lacks pullout programs that only serve a subset of students). Sixty percent of principals in schools offering schoolwide programs reported that Title I services were indistinguishable from services provided to all children. In those schools in which Title I services were distinguishable from the regular program, the most common distinction was the provision of additional services to educationally-disadvantaged students who would have traditionally received Title I services in a targeted program. Only 12 % of schools reported using a pullout model (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). Principals in one major urban district indicated that during the first years of the transition from targeted to schoolwide programs, the schools operating schoolwide programs reallocated more resources to providing services to all children. (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993).

Classroom Instruction and Curricula

Perhaps the most critical components of schoolwide programs are those which potentially have a direct influence on the classroom. Schoolwide program principals reported having introduced or significantly strengthened the following components of curriculum and instruction: computer-assisted instruction (over three-fourths of principals); provision of a coordinated, integrated curriculum—not pullouts; supplemental instruction (two-thirds of principals); and offering an extended school day (less than one-fourth of principals) (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Most schools operating schoolwide programs have adopted a range of innovative, comprehensive programs such as the reform model developed by Yale University professor James Comer, the School Development Program (Millsap, et al., 1992; National Association of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education, 1996).

It is difficult to obtain a clear picture of the particular ways in which the schoolwide program option actually impacts classroom instruction. However, in-depth case study analysis can help answer this question. For example, case studies of schoolwide programs identified a common theme of individualizing instruction to the needs of particular students (Stringfield, et al., 1997). Additional evidence indicates that schoolwide programs have increased the capacity of schools and teachers to provide instructional services more flexibly, as particular student needs arise; whereas traditional Title I pullout programs have typically provided instruction in a more scripted, rigid form. (Millsap, et al., 1992).

Components Associated with Effective Classroom School Practices

In addition to the components described previously, schoolwide programs often have components associated with the "Effective Schools" movement, such as extensive parental involvement and a strong instructional leader. State Title I coordinators reported that 62 % of schoolwide programs in their states incorporated components of Effective Schools programs as a main feature of their programs (Turnbull et al., 1990; U.S. Department of Education, 1992). Title I district coordinators reported that schoolwide programs implemented a wide range of effective schools practices in areas such as needs assessment, staff development, changes in classroom instruction, and changes in school management (Millsap, et al., 1992). The fact that a school possesses effective schools characteristics may have a reciprocal impact on the successful implementation of schoolwide programs. In other words, the qualities that make a school a good school may also facilitate innovation and change in that school and therefore assist in the

implementation of new initiatives, such as schoolwide programs. Case studies suggested that factors facilitating innovation included: strong principal leadership and management skills; meaningful, universally agreed upon goals; a nurturing school culture; well-qualified staff; and organizational mechanisms to support school problem-solving (Stringfield, et al., 1994; Wang, Haertel, Walberg, 1996).

Schoolwide programs have also facilitated district efforts to encourage parental involvement. Between 1987 and 1990, more districts reported "disseminating home-based education activities to reinforce classroom instruction," and using liaison staff to coordinate parent activities (Millsap, et al., 1992).

While the concept of schoolwide programs began to attract national attention in the late 1980s, research continued to lag behind during the early- and mid-1990s. Evaluation of schoolwide programs in the initial years has yielded some contradictory findings. On the one hand, findings suggest that, as a group, Title I students in schoolwide programs performed better than their peers in the more traditionally organized services, such as pullout instructional settings. On the other hand, nationwide evaluations suggest that schools adopting schoolwide programs have continued to encounter a wide range of implementation challenges. These challenges included the need for better, higher quality assessment of students and a general lack of high-quality professional development activities. Further, the database on the implementation and outcomes of Title I schoolwide projects is scanty (Wong & Wang 1994; Wang & Wong 1997; Wong & Meyer 1998). An extensive review of the literature on Title I programs since the 1988 Hawkins-Stafford amendment suggests only 13 major empirical studies on the implementation of Title I schoolwide programs (Wong and Meyer, 1998). Clearly, we need to understand whether the 1994 legislative expectations have been implemented at the school and classroom level.

Phase Three: Significant Increases in Schoolwide Program Implementation Since 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The 1994 Improving America's Schools Act lays out an ambitious agenda for systemic improvement in schools with high concentrations of at-risk students. Two provisions in the 1995 legislation have significant implications for educational opportunities for this population. The first mandates that district performance standards must apply to all students, including those receiving Title I services. The Administration's IASA proposal stated that as "Title I, bilingual education, and dozens of other federal programs must become integral to, not separate from, state and community education reforms that center on high standards" (U.S. Department of Education, 1993, p.3).

The second IASA provision promotes schoolwide initiatives in Title I schools with at least 50 % of students living in low-income families. Schoolwide programs give high-poverty schools more flexibility in using their Title I resources to ensure that all students meet district and state performance standards as stipulated in the 1994 legislation. The 1994 Act encouraged the widespread adoption of schoolwide programs. Beginning in the 1996-97 school year, the act lowered the participation threshold from schools with 75 % of children living in poverty to schools with 50 % or more of students living in poverty. Indeed, the number of Title I schoolwide programs grew from fewer than 1,200 in 1991, to more than 9,000 during the 1997-98 school year, an increase from about 10 % to 50 % of the eligible schools.

The schoolwide program strategy was intended to reduce the fragmented, categorical character of Title I programs; it was also intended to help improve the overall effectiveness of entire schools, rather than targeting services to meet the needs of the most disadvantaged sub-populations within a school. In other words, schoolwide programs are designed to shift the federal role from one focused on regulation and compliance to a more supportive role focused on "whole-school reform," working in partnership with schools to promote a more coherent, coordinated approach to instruction. These legislative expectations were further strengthened in late 1997, when Congress enacted Public Law 105-78, also known as the Obey-Porter legislation. Under

Obey-Porter, Congress appropriated an additional $145 million to support the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program (CSRD) which gives funds to states to award competitive grants to districts implementing research-based models of whole-school reform. Both IASA and Obey-Porter provide a set of legislative expectations that research suggests are essential to any successful school. These legislative expectations state that basic components of schoolwide programs or whole-school reform programs include:

- An instructional program grounded in effective, research-based methods and strategies.
- A comprehensive assessment system that measure whether student are meeting state and district subject-area content and performance standards. Schools must develop measurable goals and a system of benchmarks to measure students' progress in meeting these goals.
- High-quality professional development for teachers, aides, and other support personnel, so they can help all students meet the state and district performance standards.
- Strategies for increasing parental and community involvement.
- Strategies to identify how to utilize federal, state, local, and private resources to support and sustain the reform program.

These legislative expectations have transformed Title I from a categorical, isolated program into one that is an integral part of systemic reform, coherent with core academic standards. Together the IASA and the Obey-Porter legislation provide a unique opportunity for high-poverty schools to raise standards and to raise student achievement.

The National Study of Effective Title I Schoolwide Programs

To examine the extent to which the schoolwide programs are facilitating the implementation of system-wide school reform and improving student achievement, "The National Study of Effective Title I Schoolwide Programs" was initiated by the Laboratory for Student Success (LSS), the Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory at Temple University's Center for Research in Human Development and Education. This project will assess the extent to which the more effective and less effective schools, defined as high-performing and low-performing schools, and as measured by student test scores, have responded to the IASA's legislative expectations. Given the broadly defined legislative language, the implementation of the schoolwide provision is likely to result in wide variation at the local level. Title I schoolwide programs in high-performing schools are more likely to show a greater degree of implementation of the IASA expectations.

Specifically, this research initiative comprises three studies. The first is a series of field-based case studies of more effective and less effective schools. The second study uses the NCES Common Core database and NAEP database to analyze more effective and less effective schoolwide programs. The third study is a survey of a random sample of schools operating schoolwide programs, drawn from a list of schools provided by 47 states during the 1997-98 school year. Here we present our preliminary analysis of the comparative case studies.

The series of field-based case studies was conducted by LSS in collaboration with four other Regional Educational Laboratories: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, and Southeastern Regional Vision for Education. This cross-lab study team examined 32 schools in 9 urban and 3 county districts. Sixteen schools were identified as more effective and 14 were identified as less effective, defined in terms of student achievement levels in those schools, controlling for the effect of the average school poverty on achievement. For the study, researchers surveyed 593 teachers, 21 principals, 1,928 students, and 507 parents; recorded classroom observations of 126 teachers and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

713 students; conducted in-depth interviews with 25 principals, 169 teachers, 16 Title I district coordinators; and held 10 focus groups with groups of parents. Appendix A provides detailed information on research design, data collection instruments, and the sampling of more effective and less effective schools.

Findings from Preliminary Analysis of the Year 1 Data: Some Title I Schools Show Higher Performance

Our sample of Title I schoolwide programs can be classified into "more effective" and "less effective schools", based on our statistical analysis of their student achievement while controlling for poverty factors. Figure 1 presents a graphic summary of the achievement differences between the two types of schools in each of our selected districts. When placed along the same continuum of student achievement, the more effective schools are all above the benchmarking line, while the less effective schools are all below the line (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Standardized Average Residual Scores of Exceptional Title I Schools

The classification draws from our analysis of a database that included the school-by-school data on achievement test scores, percent of students qualified for free and reduced price lunch, enrollment, racial characteristics, and grade-levels of the schools. It should be noted that districts used different tests and the information they provided varied from 2 to 7 years. More specifically, the following tests were used: Iowa Test of Basic Skills in Atlanta, Chicago, and Denver; California Achievement Test in Cleveland; Michigan Assessment Test in Detroit; Texas Assessment of Basic Skills in Houston; New Jersey Early Warning Test in Trenton; Philadelphia Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills in Philadelphia; and Virginia School Assessment Program in all Virginia's school districts. During the 1997-98 academic year, lab researchers gathered data from 32 schools in 9 urban districts and 3 countywide districts. To identify What Works, we created two samples of schools, using our statistical model of expected academic performance, given their income characteristics.

Further, more effective and less effective Title I schoolwide program schools in the sample are very similar in terms of socioeconomic characteristics. Small variations were observed in racial composition of the student population, teacher turnover rates, and the level of concentrated poverty, but none were statistically significant. More effective Title I schoolwide programs across the geographically dispersed study sites showed a greater mean achievement level than expected given the schools' socioeconomic characteristics. This finding suggests a greater capacity of the more effective schoolwide program schools to achieve student success in spite of the odds.

Findings from Preliminary Studies of Comparative Cases

The findings from a preliminary analysis of the case-study data highlight three main findings:

- Teachers and principals have a stronger sense of accountability in effective schools.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- More effective schools are likely to meet the IASA requirements.
- District-wide academic standards have an impact on schoolwide programs.

Teacher and Principal Perceptions of Accountability and Flexibility

Findings from preliminary analysis of the case studies show that teachers in the more effective schoolwide programs, when compared to their peers in the less effective settings, tend to have an awareness of academic accountability and agree that there has been an increase in practices associated with holding students and schools accountable for their performance. Teachers in the more effective (better-performing) schools consistently showed a stronger degree of agreement with each other about accountability issues in their schools. For example, as Table 1 shows, 42 % of the teachers in the 16 better-performing schools "agreed' or "strongly agreed" with the statement that there has been "an increase in students' standardized test scores" since their school adopted a schoolwide program; only 32 % of teachers in the 14 lower-performing schools agreed. Fifty-five percent of the teachers in the better-performing schools suggested that their school's performance has been clearly documented. There were also slightly more teachers in the better-performing schools who agreed that "federal and state monitoring practices" primarily focused on schooling quality (45 % in the better-performing schools versus 42 % in the lower-performing schools). Descriptive statistics in the teachers' responses between the better- and lower-performing schools are also shown in Table 1.

The principals' views about accountability were generally consistent with the teachers' responses. We were able to interview 11 principals of the better-performing schools and 11 principals of the lower-performing schools. While 7 of the 11 principals in the better performing schools "noticed an increase in students' standardized test scores" following schoolwide implementation, 6 of the 11 principals in lower performing schools agreed with the statement. All

11 principals in the better-performing schools agreed or strongly agreed that their school performance has been clearly documented, compared to 9 of the 11 principals in the lower-performing schools. Documentation is an important dimension of accountability, because keeping records of student performance is one way a school can show it is paying attention to student performance.

With regard to how federal Title I resources have affected teaching conditions, teachers' responses differed slightly between the two types of schools. In the better-performing schools, fewer teachers reported that Title I funds were used to reduce class size. Only 1 out of 4 teachers in better-performing schools mentioned that they made use of the resources at the federal Title I technical assistance centers, while only 1 out of 5 of them rated the technical assistance centers as providing useful resources for their school. Principals, too, seemed to have some reservations about the technical assistance centers. Only 4 of the 11 principals in both the better-performing and the lower-performing schools mentioned that they "have taken advantage of resources available" at the technical centers. Interestingly, more than 40% of the teachers in both better- and lower-performing schools reported that federal resources facilitated flexibility and creativity to meet the educational needs. At least 6 of the 11 principals in both types of schools also valued the flexibility and creativity that federal resources afforded them. In other words, schoolwide programs have allowed for variation in local instructional practices.

According to the teacher surveys, only 33% of the teachers in better-performing schools felt that they exercised "significant input in decisions about the use of federal resources" at their school. (See Table 1) This is lower than the 41% in the lower-performing effective schools. In contrast, a clear majority of teachers in both types of schools reported that the school effectively involved parents in the "planning and improvement of Title I supported activities" in their schools, as suggested in Table 1. Not surprisingly, teachers felt that their decision-making power is not as extensive as the parents'. Consistent with the teachers' view, virtually all the principals reported

effective parental involvement in the planning and improvement of Title I-supported activities in their schools.

More Effective Schools Are Likely to Meet the IASA Expectations

Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations with the results of Anovas (a statistical technique to analyze variance) for the teacher survey scales, in the survey in which we interviewed 593 teachers on Title I schoolwide legislative expectations and school climate/governance. As shown in Table 2 and Table 3, teachers rated all the implementation components and school climate scales above the mean (range 1 to 5; mean 3). They gave the highest ratings to instructional strategies with cooperative learning emphasis and student/teacher relationships, while they gave the lowest ratings to the allocation and availability of resources, and student discipline/behavior school problems. The results suggest that more effective compared to less effective schoolwide programs show stronger implementation of student performance goals, academic standards and assessments, enriched curriculum, student-centered instruction, evaluation of student performance, availability and usefulness of professional development, resource allocation and availability, accountability, and parent involvement. Also, teachers from higher-performing schools rate the quality of teacher-student relationships, colleague relationships, principal leadership, student discipline/behavior problems, and student attitudes toward schooling significantly higher than teachers from less effective schools. The two groups do not differ statistically significantly in their views of the quality of implementation of cooperative learning strategies and shared decisionmaking components. These results indicate that more effective schools are implementing the IASA legislative expectations to a great degree, and also have more positive school climate/governance than less effective schools.

District-wide Academic Standards Shape Schoolwide Programs

Our study found that urban districts are paying increasing attention to low-performing schools, many of which are implementing Title I schoolwide programs. In many states, it is the state accountability effort that is prompting this. In the nine districts we studied, district reform agendas include creating a general emphasis on accountability and providing guidelines for resource allocation and professional development. For example, Tacoma has a district-wide literacy program that focuses on improving literacy in low-performing schools. In Chicago, schools on probation receive additional local resources to recruit external partners to address their needs. Philadelphia's Teaching and Learning Network, discussed in more details below, is one example of the kinds of technical support the district provides to schools. Clearly, district-wide standards are affecting the way schoolwide programs are implemented in these districts. In this section, we briefly discuss our preliminary analysis of the interview data from four of our sample districts (Philadelphia, Montgomery County, Chicago, and Tacoma) using the NUD•IST program, a computer program that assists in the sorting and classification of qualitative data.

Philadelphia, PA

In determining the impact of the Philadelphia public schools' reform agenda on the implementation of Title I schoolwide programs in that city, our analysis focused on the connection between the district's Children Achieving reform initiative and implementation of Title I schoolwide programs in the participating sample schools. Under the leadership of Superintendent David W. Hornbeck, the Children Achieving initiative is focused on ensuring that Philadelphia children can perform at high levels so they can enter the 21st century with confidence about their future. The plan spells out the steps the district needs to take over the next four and one-half years and is based on a ten-part framework, described below. The Children Achieving initiative is comprehensive in scope, ranging from setting new high standards for students so they can compete in our global economy, to creating the additional time teachers need to prepare students to meet

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

those standards. It has involved the implementation of full-day kindergarten, reductions in class size, and the reorganization of the entire structure of the School District into clusters of schools, and the division of large schools into Small Learning Communities (SLC).

In the ten-part reform framework for Children Achieving, each of the ten components contains a statement of vision and rationale, specific strategies describing how to achieve this vision, and a time-line identifying significant steps in this process:

1. Set high expectations for everyone.
2. Design accurate performance indicators to hold everyone accountable for results.
3. Shrink the centralized bureaucracy and let schools make more decisions.
4. Provide intensive and sustained professional development to all staff.
5. Make sure that all students are ready for school.
6. Provide students with the community supports and services they need to succeed in school.
7. Provide up-to-date technology and instructional materials.
8. Engage the public in shaping, understanding, supporting and participating in school reform.
9. Ensure adequate resources and use them effectively.
10. Be prepared to address all of these priorities together and for the long term – starting now.

Small Learning Communities (SLC) are also a significant strategy of the reform initiative. The district has broken up large schools into smaller subgroups, in an effort to ensure students, teachers and parents become part of a small, more closely-knit community. Most are formed around a particular theme, such as cultural diversity. Each Small Learning Community serves between 200 and 500 students. Students are grouped heterogeneously instead of being tracked by ability level, and all students are expected to meet rigorous standards. The district holds the Small

Learning Communities accountable for student achievement and each SLC has decision-making authority commensurate with how well its students are performing. The district also seeks to connect the Small Learning Communities closely with parents and with community resources and services.

Our data indicates that by the second year of the Children Achieving initiative, schools and clusters were beginning to integrate the district reform initiative into their existing Title I schoolwide programs. Following an initial period of political conflict and policy confusion, educators began to accommodate and adapt the reforms to the cluster, school, and classroom levels.

Highlights of the ways the Children Achieving initiative is strengthening the professional capacity of the Title I schoolwide programs in Philadelphia are discussed below.

District Restructuring: Cluster Services for Schoolwide Programs

Administrators created a created Teaching and Learning Network (TLN), an initiative to provide training and other support to teachers and principals at the cluster level. The network is composed of one coordinator for each cluster, six to eight facilitators, and an equity coordinator. The equity coordinator tracks Title I programs, desegregation efforts, special education efforts, and ESL programs, and keeps schools informed of a broad array of equity issues. During the initial implementation period, at the cluster level the TLN coordinators, facilitators, and equity coordinators continued to define their roles and establish their relationships with the schools. In each of the four study sites, the TLN was actively organizing new types of professional development activities for teachers both at the cluster offices and at the schools.

There was considerable variation as to how frequently the TLN staff visited the schools. By the second year of the reform initiative, all four clusters and their respective schools had established schedules of when, where, and what type of professional development support services

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the TLN would provide to teachers. Further, the equity coordinators worked with the TLN to customize professional development to meet the needs of schools with high proportions of at-risk students. In each site, a system of support was clearly emerging.

School Restructuring: Small Learning Communities and School Councils

By the second reform year, nearly every cluster leader and teacher in the schools we visited had positive things to say about the concept of breaking up large schools into smaller learning communities. The Small Learning Communities (SLCs) were frequently mentioned by teachers as one of the most positive aspects of the Children Achieving agenda. After a year of working in the small communities, several teachers said it gave them more time to plan with other teachers, time that was not previously built into their schedule for this purpose. Teachers were also able to share instructional strategies with each other during this new planning time. In Title I schoolwide sites, SLCs facilitated the instruction of students in heterogeneous groups rather than tracking them by ability level. In turn, Title I funds and program staff helped facilitate the development of SLCs.

The Small Learning Community concept meshed well with the goals of the Title I schoolwide programs because both focus on holding all students to high standards of performance and integrating them into a single learning community with a common curriculum. However, the district's School Council initiative has not blended as successfully with these goals. Each of the four schoolwide sites reported having had difficulty establishing the school councils and securing the necessary parent vote of support to be officially approved by the district. Often times, schools already had existing governing bodies and saw the new council as superfluous. It remains to be seen whether they will have a positive impact on the operation of schoolwide programs.

Classroom Level-Academic Standards and Assessment

While the clusters and SLCs change represented a new form of organizational structures, both at the district and school level, the new standards and assessments introduced under Children Achieving blended very well with the goals of the Title I schoolwide programs at the classroom and instructional level. In many cases, Title I funding has helped provide professional development time for teachers to learn how to design and prepare for tests required under the Children Achieving Initiative, and the new TLN support services provided by the cluster initiative has given teachers the assistance necessary to improve their day-to-day teaching. Equity coordinators and teachers were able to set aside time to review the pace of students' academic progress at the schoolwide sites. In short, there were positive intersections between Children Achieving and Title I that seemed to directly impact and improve education for at-risk students at the classroom level.

Conclusion

Our study of the Children Achieving reform in four Title I schoolwide sites suggests a pattern of implementation that is common to other educational reform: a period of initial conflict and confusion, followed by a gradual adaptation and accommodation of the reforms to the school settings. There is a close match between the legislative expectations for Title I schoolwide programs and the Children Achieving agenda. This match has greatly facilitated the interface of Title I schoolwide implementation and district-based reforms. Our preliminary findings suggest that teachers expressed satisfaction with the changes at the classroom instructional level toward the end of the second reform year.

Montgomery County, MD

The implementation of Title I schoolwide programs in the Montgomery County, Maryland public schools provides another illustration of the significant role of district-wide reform initiatives. While Montgomery County is a relatively affluent suburb, its demographics are changing, posing challenges similar to those in urban school districts. Among these challenges are the fact that the

student population is increasingly diverse, including a growing number of students from minority and low-income backgrounds, and the county teaching staff is not fully prepared to meet their needs. These professional-development concerns, coupled with fiscal limitations have also raised concerns about the district's capacity to support the program implementation needs of the school staff. Fifty-eight schools in the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) are eligible to receive federal Title I funds. Three of these are operating schoolwide programs because 50% or more of their students are low-income students.

In response to these challenges, the MCPS adopted a reform initiative know as "Success for Every Student" (SES) in 1992. The initiative employs broad system-wide strategies to raise student achievement. It specifies various tasks for schools, central administrative offices, parents, and communities, to achieve four goals: (a) ensure academic success for every student; (b) provide an effective instructional program; (c) strengthen partnerships for education; and (d) create a self-renewing organization with a positive work climate in which staff effectiveness and creativity are encouraged, respected, valued, and supported to promote productivity and ownership for student success, with the instructional program including efficient and effective support and staff development.

In Montgomery County, the central question of our research was what impact the MCPS reform initiative was having on the quality of instruction and curriculum in schools operating schoolwide programs. Our preliminary analysis of data collected from two of the three schoolwide programs in Montgomery County suggests that the district initiative raised two schools' expectations about student performance, (a similar finding observed in Philadelphia). Teachers said the entire staff's effort is necessary to ensure that students pass the Maryland statewide test. Our classroom observations also suggest that a fair amount of time was devoted to preparing students for meeting the accountability standards, as measured by the district-wide reading and math tests.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

While all three schoolwide programs had a strong focus on student performance, the programs adopted different instructional strategies. At one school, teachers relied heavily on test data to group students by their level of performance, regrouping them as they progressed. In another, teachers used aides to assist small groups of students needing extra attention within the regular classroom setting. Further, one school focused on developing students' writing skills across all academic subjects. As a fifth-grade math teacher pointed out, "Students have their entries every day and whatever they answer has to be in complete sentences. We have a little symbol that says 'sentences please.' We try to have them write more and use complete sentences."

Overall, schoolwide programs in MCPS seemed to benefit from a district that is fiscally sound with a vision of educational accountability focused on success for every student. In terms of student achievement, one of the schools showed particularly strong performance in math at both the third and the fifth grades. Given the district's relatively sound resource base, it is not surprising to see extensive professional development activity, organized parental involvement, and perhaps, most importantly, teacher collegiality.

Chicago, IL

Since 1996, the Chicago school board has intervened directly in the district's lowest performing schools, employing a variety of strategies to raise student achievement. For example, the school board places schools on probation if more than 15 % of students scored at or below the national norm in math and reading, but also provides additional resources to help the schools improve. The district also terminated social promotion (the practice of promoting, rather than holding back, students who are not ready for the next grade) and required students to meet basic standards on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Students who fail the test in the spring are required to attend summer school and retake the test in August.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In addition, the district developed the Chicago Academic Standards (CAS) and Curriculum Framework Statements (CFS). The standards and frameworks define "what students should know and be able to do" in four core curriculum areas: Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. All students, including special needs students and those with limited English proficiency, are expected to meet these standards. Teachers are expected to adjust instructional materials to meet the needs of all their students.

Given Chicago's nationally known focus on educational accountability, there is an increased focus on improving student test scores in all the schoolwide programs throughout the district. Teachers now pay more serious attention to test preparation, particularly in the few weeks prior to the administration of ITBS in the Spring because of the new high-stakes consequences. They use test preparation materials distributed by the district or state, and also attend district-sponsored workshops on test-taking skills. Teachers and students are also tending more often to adopt instructional strategies focused on basic skills, because they believe this will help students do well on their tests.

Tacoma, WA

In 1997, the State of Washington established the "Essential Learnings," a set of content and performance standards. The state set benchmarks in four areas—reading, writing, mathematics and communications—in grades 4, 7, and 10; benchmarks for science, social studies, arts and health and fitness are set at grades 4 and 5 and grades 7 and 8. The Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) is a state test that is aligned with Essential Learnings.

Despite the state's efforts to publicize the new standards, both school staff and parents appear more focused on the district's policy to end social promotion, rather than school performance on state tests. A majority of teacher responses on our survey supported a strict district-wide policy on promotion, but a number of teachers at the two schools we visited expressed

concern that students who fail will not get the assistance they need. Also, principals and district administrators in these two schools expressed concern about the possibility of their students earning low student scores on the Essential Learning Assessments. This concern is well founded, since meeting state performance standards will pose a tremendous challenge for these two schools; they are currently on probation for being low-scoring schools. As of the fall of 1997, the district had not yet announced a plan to address the needs of students who fail to meet district and state standards. In spring of 1997, district Title I administrators reported that the district was considering instituting a summer school requirement for low-scoring students. Principals were still waiting for guidelines from the district about summer school.

The district also sought to reduce the student-to-adult ratio in the classroom, and, in most cases, eliminating pullouts for low-income students and special-needs students. Staff at both schools reported using the in-class method under the Targeted Assistance School (TAS) model. One example of how this method is used in Tacoma is an ESL aide who provides in-class English instruction in one school, while a learning specialist provided in-class assistance to students with learning disabilities. To address the individual needs of low achieving students, teachers and learning specialists at all Tacoma schools work together to create Individual Acceleration Plans (IAP). Parents are invited to join teachers in the IAP evaluations, which take place at school three times a year.

Tacoma's central office plays a major role in decision-making about curriculum and grade level benchmarks. In 1995, the district adopted a Houghton Mifflin literacy program to be used districtwide. The program drives literacy instruction at both schools. Those teachers who mentioned the program said they were satisfied with the curriculum and found that it provides consistency in instruction and assessment across different grade levels.

Conclusion

In short, the four districts have developed aspects of what we call an "academic accountability framework." These aspects of accountability include:

- defining academic standards that apply to all schools, including Title I schoolwide programs;
- creating district-wide tests that may be used to determine whether students are promoted;
- raising expectations on the school's capacity to improve performance.

Clearly, district-directed standards are likely to have important implications for inner-city schools with large concentrations of disadvantaged students. But district-initiated pressure is not likely to improve student performance in lower-performing schools if the district does not provide additional resources and professional support. As urban districts raise the accountability standards, there is clearly a need to maintain an infrastructure of support for schoolwide programs. In light of these concerns, in the next section we will propose ways in which the federal government can more actively engage in creating the necessary systemic conditions to support teaching and learning in schoolwide programs.

Policy Implications and Recommendations:

Toward Procedural Accountability

The current education reform climate in the United States stems in part from growing public concern over the general quality of schooling. As our review of the 35-year history of Title I suggests, there is increasing attention among policymakers on the need to identify a broad-based range of student performance outcomes and to hold schools accountable for providing effective instruction to all students, particularly those at risk of leaving school unprepared for work and/or further learning. Findings about the implementation of schoolwide programs since IASA was

enacted in 1994 suggest that Title I can be a part of national efforts toward systemic improvement. In this section, we explore the broader implications of our findings in the context of the current reauthorization of Title I and whole-school reform efforts.

Based on our analysis of the implementation of Title I over the years, we believe that Congress should reauthorize Title I in 1999. At the same time, we propose that the U.S. Congress consider our framework of procedural accountability. This notion of accountability would enhance the support and assessment functions of the federal government in the implementation of Title I schoolwide programs in high-poverty schools. Such a framework would include several specific components: a federal partnership with urban districts to raise academic standards in high-poverty schools, new efforts to promote systemwide student assessment, and greater attention to increasing the professional capacity of schools. In this concluding section, we will discuss these policy recommendations.

Strengthen the Accountability Functions of the District

Federal legislative expectations for Title I programs have been expanded to include challenging state/district content and performance standards. States and districts are developing content and performance standards for Title I students, expecting all children to master the same knowledge and skills. The federal government also needs to align Title I program services with the state and district content standards, to ensure schools are held accountable for their Title I students meeting district and state standards. The schoolwide program design offers a built-in organizational mechanism through which the Title I legislative expectations can be linked with schools', districts' and states' ongoing standards-based reform efforts.

System-wide Assessment on Student Outcomes in Title I Schools

To create the infrastructure required to sustain the use of schoolwide programs as an improvement strategy, the federal government can encourage districts to improve accountability of Title I schoolwide programs by establishing clear guidance and support for measuring, analyzing, and reporting student performance using a district-wide assessment framework based on the district policy on an annual or semi-annual basis. Because many intervention strategies in schoolwide programs focus on early literacy, districts should begin collecting student performance information as early as the first grade (both at the beginning and end of the school year).

There is currently some unevenness among districts in the use of standardized tests to measure student progress in Title I schools. Often, districts adopt their own local assessments that fit local reform models, but to fully understand whether the schoolwide program is effective, districts need to be able to compare the performance of students in schoolwide programs to their peers in non-Title I schools in the same district or state.

Furthermore, schools operating schoolwide programs and districts can use the implementation of schoolwide programs and the associated accountability requirements as an opportunity to consider expanding the ways in which evaluation and assessment are used for the entire school. In many states, it is the state accountability system that will be a far more powerful influence for schools to use evaluation and assessment for the entire school. For example, student assessment for Title I accountability purposes can guide instruction and improve the teaching practice of the entire school. Similarly, the use of alternative strategies for assessing student outcomes can be applied schoolwide to increase coordination of programming across units and departments, both within schools and at the district level.

Schoolwide programs also create a context in which the roles of principals and district staff can be reevaluated. Most schools operating schoolwide programs have spent relatively short periods of time planning the programs before implementing them, and have received mixed levels of support from the district level. Furthermore, there is evidence that schoolwide programs have

significantly increased professional-development opportunities for teachers to address school-specific implementation needs. Districts might use the transition to a new schoolwide program as a chance to provide professional development that is more targeted to the needs of the school staff, e.g., providing professional development on how to phase out the use pullout programs or how to integrate traditional Title I reading and math curricula with the rest of the school curricula.

Build a Knowledge Base

District and school professionals need to collaborate on building a knowledge base in order to successfully implement Title I schoolwide programs in varied settings across the district and state. This lack of knowledge has contributed to the lack of implementation of schoolwide programs to date. This is a central research and development task necessary for achieving wide-scale application of comprehensive whole-school reform to achieve the national goal of schooling success for every student.

Hold Schools Accountable for School Affects in Raising the Expectation for Schooling Success for Every Student

Educators and policymakers at all levels need to work together to raise the expectations of schoolwide programs for all students in a given school. The federal government can take the lead by calling attention to the presence of achievement gaps within individual schools (for a thorough discussion, see Goertz and Chun, this volume). Federal legislation can encourage districts to design and implement strategic plans that narrow the learning gap between different racial/ethnic and income groups within a schoolwide program. In this regard, further research on Title I implementation and outcomes needs to focus on establishing databases on student performance variation within and across schools at the district/state level.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Create Incentives for Schoolwide Programs to Select Professional Development that Meets their Particular Needs

Schoolwide program schools in our national sample recognize and emphasize the importance of professional development, and many teachers discuss positive experiences with this professional development. However, there appears to be a gap in the content matter, opportunity, and/or delivery of professional development which in turn has had an impact on the implementation of schoolwide programs. There is a lack of consistent Title I schoolwide funding to plan and implement the programs. Both school personnel and students suffer from lack of consistency. The quality of teaching must be a central focus of schoolwide improvement. Both federal and district leadership can take a more active role in ensuring stable support for professional development in schoolwide programs.

From a broader perspective, forging stronger links between research and practice is an integral part of comprehensive school reform and will help achieve the ultimate goal of ensuring success for every student. Strategic partnerships between schoolwide programs and R&D organizations (such as universities and Regional Educational Laboratories) should be explored. The opportunity to redefine decision-making roles at the school level can facilitate the creation of more inclusive and efficient infrastructures that better serve the needs of schools' increasingly diverse student populations. For example, schools can combine expanded teacher input into school decisionmaking with an effort to create professional networks that encourage teachers to initiate and sustain schoolwide program approaches that support and cultivate changes at the classroom level. Similarly, schoolwide programs offer opportunities to explore broader governance issues. For example, alternative approaches to the functions of and relationships among the district, school, and classroom levels can be explored, as well as particular types of parental involvement. These are the kinds of issues that Congress can address during this reauthorization.

References

Commission on Chapter 1. (1992).

Elmore, R. (1980). Backward Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decisions. *Political Science Quarterly*, 94(4), 601-616.

Kirst, M. (1988). The federal role and Chapter 1: Rethinking some basic assumptions. In D. Doyle & B. Cooper (Eds.), *Federal aid to the disadvantaged: What future for Chapter 1?* London: Falmer Press.

McLaughlin, M. (1987). Learning from Experience: Lessons form Policy Implementation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 9(2), 171-178.

McLaughlin, M., & Berman, P. (1978). *Federal program supporting educational change vol. 8: Implementing and sustaining innovation.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Martin, R., & McClure, P. (1969). *Title I of ESEA: Is it helping poor children?* Washington, DC: Washington Research Project of the Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy and the NAACP Legal Defense of Education Fund.

Milbrey, M. (1990). The RAND change agent study revisited: Macro perspective and realities. *Educational Researcher*, 19(9), 11-16.

Millsap, M. A., Turnbull, B., Moss, M., Brigham, N., Gamse, B., & Marks, E. (1992). *The Chapter 1 implementation study: Interim report.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Peterson, P. E., Rabe, B., & Wong, K. (1986). *When federalism works.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Schenck, E. A., & Beckstrom, S. (1993). *Chapter 1 schoolwide project study: Final report.* Hampton, NH: RMC Research Corporation.

Smith, M. S. (1988). Selecting students and services for Chapter 1. In D. Doyle & B. Cooper, (Eds.), *Federal aid to the disadvantaged: What future for Chapter 1?* London: Falmer Press.

Stringfield, S., Billig, S., & Davis, A. (1991). Chapter 1 program improvement: Cause for cautious optimism and a call for much more research. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 13(4), 399-406.

Stringfield, S., Winfield, L., Millsap, M. A., Puma, M. J., Gamse, B., & Randall, B. (1994). *Urban and suburban rural special strategies for education disadvantaged children: First year report.* Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

Timar, T. (1994). Program design and assessment strategies in Chapter 1. In M. C. Wang & K. K. Wong (Eds.), *Rethinking policy for at-risk students.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Turnbull, B. J., Zeldin, S., & Cain, T. (1990). *State administration of the amended Chapter 1 program.* Washington, DC: Policy Studies Association.

U.S. Department of Education. (1993). *Prospects: The Congressionally mandated study of educational growth and opportunity: The interim report.* Washington, DC: Author.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1996). *Educational practices and policies that promote achievement.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education.

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1993, March 24). Reform all categorical programs. *Education Week*, p. 64.

Wang, M. C., & Stull, J. (1999). *The impact of Title I schoolwide programs on student outcomes based on a secondary analysis of the Common Core of Data.* Unpublished manuscript, Philadelphia: Laboratory for Student Success.

Wang, M. C., & Wong, K. K. (Eds.). (1997). *Implementing school reform: Practice and policy imperatives.* Philadelphia: Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education.

Wang, M. C., & Reynolds, M. C. (1995). *Making a difference for students at risk: Trends and alternatives.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1994). Serving students at the margins. *Educational Leadership*, 52(4), 12-17.

Winfield, L. F., & Hawkins, R. (1993). *Longitudinal effects of Chapter 1 schoolwide projects on the achievement of disadvantaged students.* Baltimore: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Wong, K. K. (1990). *City choices: Education and housing.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wong, K. K., & Meyer, S. (1998). Title I schoolwide programs: A synthesis of findings from recent evaluation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 20(2), 115-136.

Wong, K. K., Sunderman, G., & Lee, J. (1994). *When federal Chapter 1 works to improve student learning in inner city schools: Preliminary findings on schoolwide projects in Minneapolis.* Philadelphia: National Center on Education in the Inner Cities.

Wong, K. K., Sunderman, G. & Lee, J. (1997). Redesigning the federal compensatory education program. Lessons from the implementation of the Title I schoolwide projects. In M. C. Wang & K. K. Wong, (Eds.), *Implementing school reform: Practice and policy imperatives.* Philadelphia: Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education, 59-97.

Wong, K. K., & Wang, M. C. (Eds.). (1994). *Rethinking policy for at-risk students.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Table 1
Teacher Responses to the Implementation of Federal Title I Policy, 1998

	More Effective (%)	Less Effective (%)	Difference (%) Btw. More and Less Accountability
Question 5	N=341	N=241	
Since my school began implementing a Title I Schoolwide project, I have noticed an increase in students' standardized test scores.			
Disagree	11.1 (341)	15.7	
Uncertain	46.9	52.3	
Agree	42.0	32.0	10.0
Question 35	N=343	N=235	
The progress or lack of progress my school has made toward Title I goals is clearly documented.			
Disagree	3.2	3.8	
Uncertain	42.0	48.1	
Agree	54.8	48.1	6.7
Question 41	N=339	N=239	
Federal and state monitoring practices focus primarily on the educational quality of my school.			
Disagree	8.6	8.0	
Uncertain	46.6	50.6	
Agree	44.9	41.4	3.5
Resources/Teaching Conditions			
Question 18	N=344	N=239	
Title I funding has helped reduce class size in the school.			
Disagree	34.0	36.9	
Uncertain	30.8	22.6	
Agree	35.2	40.6	-5.4
Question 28	N=335	N=240	
I have taken advantage of resources available at federal technical assistance centers.			
Disagree	38.0	42.5	
Uncertain	36.7	25.4	
Agree	25.4	32.1	-6.7
Question 29	N=334	N=237	
The federal technical assistance centers provide useful resources for my school.			
Disagree	15.3	20.6	
Uncertain	63.5	54.4	
Agree	21.3	24.9	-3.6
Question 30	N=339	N=233	
Federal resources have facilitated the increased capacity of my school to meet its needs in flexible and creative ways.			
Disagree	14.1	16.7	
Uncertain	44.8	39.5	
Agree	41.0	43.7	-2.7
Decision-making in Title I Program			
Question 31	N=340	N=238	
Teachers have significant input in decisions about the use of federal resources at my school.			
Disagree	30.6	28.2	
Uncertain	35.6	31.1	
Agree	33.8	40.8	-7.0
Question 42	N=341	N=244	
My school effectively involves parents in the planning and improvement of Title I supported activities.			
Disagree	14.9	15.2	
Uncertain	25.8	25.8	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Agree	59.2	59.0	0.2

Table 2
Teacher Views of Legislative Goals

	Less Effective Mean	SD	More Effective Mean	SD	Anova F
	(N=245)		(N=348)		
Legislative Expectations					
Student performance goals	3.78	.56	4.02	.54	25.06***
Standards/Assessment	3.65	.77	3.89	.71	13.71**
Evaluation	3.99	.60	4.18	.52	14.14**
Enriched curriculum	3.57	.68	3.85	.68	22.28***
Student-centered instruction	3.87	.61	4.04	.57	10.85***
Cooperative learning instruction	4.11	.58	4.22	.56	5.27*
Professional development	3.74	.70	3.92	.72	9.35**
Allocation and availability of resources	3.25	.63	3.34	.61	2.70
Accountability	3.64	.57	3.76	.55	6.87**
Parent involvement	3.77	.56	3.87	.58	4.15*

* $p < .05$ ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.0001$

Table 3
Teacher Views of Climate, Governance and School Effectiveness

	Less Effective Mean (N=245)	SD	More Effective Mean (N=348)	SD	Anova F
School Climate/Governance					
Teacher/Student relationships	4.13	.54	4.33	.51	20.15***
Colleague relationships	3.85	.73	4.10	.60	19.22***
Shared decision making	3.10	.97	3.13	.97	0.18
Principal leadership	3.70	.92	3.92	.80	9.37**
Student behavior/discipline problems	3.07	.51	3.26	.50	18.88***
Student attitude	3.71	.65	3.96	.62	20.96***

* $p < .05$ ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.0001$

Appendix

Research Design and Coordination of Data Collection

To bridge the critical gap between research and policy, the Laboratory for Student Success at Temple University (LSS), the Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory at the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education, initiated a collaborative study on Title I schoolwide programs with four regional laboratories in the summer of 1996. The collaborating labs include Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL), North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL), Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL), and Southeastern Regional Vision for Education (SERVE). This research project is based on a program of study initiated at the National Center on Education in the Inner Cities (see Wong et al., 1997). The cross-lab collaboration has two major goals: (a) develop a national database on the implementation and outcomes of Title I schoolwide programs; and (b) provide assistance to schools, districts, and states in an effort to demonstrate and maintain a high degree of implementation of schoolwide programs that are effective in achieving student success in a variety of school settings across different geographic regions.

This study examines several policy questions regarding the effectiveness of Title I schoolwide programs.

- Is there a relationship between the 1994 IASA Title I legislative expectations for higher standards and better student performance?
- Are higher-performing schools more ready to meet these legislative expectations?
- How do better-performing schoolwide programs differ from their lower-performing peers?
- What kinds of instructional strategies are used in better-performing schools?

- Can we develop a procedural knowledge base on What Works regarding Title I schoolwide programs?

Our efforts to address these issues will have broad policy implications on the 1999 reauthorization of Title I as well as on the ongoing discussion on comprehensive school reform.

Legislative Expectations Form the Basis of Survey and Interview Instruments

A major focus of this study is to examine the level of implementation of the legislative expectations for Title I schoolwide programs in the 1994 IASA. These legislative expectations are outlined in a booklet entitled, "An Overview of Title I Schoolwide Programs: Federal Legislative Expectations" (Wong and Meyer 1998), produced by the Laboratory for Student Success. Drawing on the key components of the schoolwide initiative as laid out in earlier drafts of the booklet, staff at the Laboratory for Student Success developed specific means of measuring implementation of various concepts, including schoolwide vision, organizational climate, instructional strategies, and curriculum standards.

To measure the level of Title I legislative expectations as implemented in our study sites, LSS staff created the following scaled indicators (1) in both the teacher and parent survey instruments: student performance goals (13 items); standards/assessment (4 items); student evaluation (5 items); enriched curriculum (6 items); student-centered instruction (5 items); cooperative learning instruction (4 items); professional development (6 items); level and use of resources (8 items); accountability (6 items); and parent involvement (10 items). Furthermore, we measure overall school climate and school governance using scales of the following indicators: teacher/student relationships (4 items), colleague relationships (5 items), shared decision making (3 items), principal leadership (5 items), scope of problems in school (13 items), student activities (4

items), student attitudes (6 items), and parent satisfaction toward schools (7 items). Item details will be included below when we present our findings.

It should be noted that the focus and length of the teacher and parent questionnaires were somewhat different, to reflect respondents' different role and perspectives on the schoolwide program. While parent questionnaires focused on school climate and parent involvement issues, teacher questionnaires included these issues in addition to school governance. All the questionnaires included the 5 Likert Scale (2) with "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" responses. Scales were developed with the basis of both conceptual frameworks and empirical factor analysis. The mean of inter-item reliabilities of the scales was 0.80.

We measured classroom practices using an observation instrument for teachers and students during reading and/or math periods. Our focus was on instructional strategies, instructional settings, types of interactions between students and teachers, and students' on-task behavior. Instructional setting for students is differentiated in terms of students working in the whole class, in a small class, and in a individual setting. Instructional setting for teachers is differentiated by whole class, small class, teacher's desk, student's desk, and traveling. Interaction style for students included categories of no interaction, interaction with teachers, and interaction with others. Interaction style for teachers included categories of no interaction, interaction with instructional purposes, and interaction with managerial purposes for teachers. Percentage of occurrences of each of these categories of interaction during 10 intervals within each class was separately calculated.

The research team also used open-ended questionnaires in their interviews with principals, teachers, and Title I coordinators at the district level. Questions are designed to connect school practices in the context of the systemic agenda set forth in the IASA. The types of questions asked included the following:

- Resource allocation: How do schools allocate federal, state, and local resources differently as a result of schoolwide programs?
- Teacher recruitment and professional development: How creative are schools in recruiting teachers? Do they engage in new kinds of professional development?
- Inclusion practices: Do schools move to eliminate pullout practices? Or do they maintain pull out for different categories of students?
- Curriculum design: How do schools decide on curricular materials? We transcribed interview and then analyzed them using NUD•IST to determine the relevance of the legislative expectations in school practices. We will present an analysis of our interviews later.

Selection of Schoolwide Schools with Varying Performance but Comparable SES Characteristics

To develop a comparable pool of better-performing and poorly-performing Title I schoolwide schools, we employed statistical methods that modeled the schools' academic performance, given the composition of their student population, and to what extent it was comprised of at-risk students. We tried to identify schoolwides that varied in student performance but possessed similar socio-economic characteristics. Our school selection procedures began with each participating laboratory contacting one or more of the school districts within its region for research access. The LSS received detailed information on every elementary and middle school in each school district, from the districts via the lab. LSS used the core database to determine site selection. The database included the school-by-school data on achievement test scores, percent of students qualified for free and reduced price lunch, enrollment, racial characteristics, and level of the schools. It should be noted that districts used different tests and the information they provided

varied from 2 to 7 years. More specifically, the following tests were used: Iowa Test of Basic Skills in Atlanta, Chicago, and Denver; California Achievement Test in Cleveland; Michigan Assessment Test in Detroit; Texas Assessment of Basic Skills in Houston; New Jersey Early Warning Test in Trenton; Philadelphia Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills in Philadelphia; and Virginia School Assessment Program in all Virginia's school districts.

Coordination of Data Collection

During the 1997-98 academic year, lab researchers gathered data from 32 schools in 9 urban districts and 3 countywide districts. To identify what works, we created two samples of schools, using our statistical model of expected academic performance, given their income characteristics. All together, the cross-lab study team collected surveys from 593 teachers, 21 principals, 1,928 students, and 507 parents. Interviews were conducted with 25 principals, 169 teachers, 10 parent focus groups, and 16 Title I district coordinators.

Each participating laboratory was responsible for obtaining permission to conduct research in its selected district(s). Reports and other policy documents on Title I were collected from each participating district. Schools were then selected based on regression analysis of their student achievement and socioeconomic characteristics as mentioned above. Each laboratory then made contact with the sample of schools and worked out the site visit schedule. Lab researchers visited the study sites to explain the purpose of the project to the principal and teachers, and to finalize the data collection plan. At each participating school, researchers administered questionnaires to teachers and principals during a faculty meeting, with the exception of a few schools where teachers completed the questionnaires individually and returned them by mail to the researchers or the laboratory. Parent questionnaires were completed at home. Observation for reading and math classes was conducted by trained researchers, using an observation instrument developed by the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Laboratory for Student Success at Temple University. To ensure consistency in the observations, one or more researchers from each collaborating laboratory were trained by LSS on how conduct classroom observation,. Before researchers conducted their classroom observation, they requested a list of teachers and students from the study sites. Using this information, lab researchers randomly selected six students in each classroom for focused observation in terms of teacher-student interaction. Each observation lasted for about 45 minutes: 5 minutes total for a teacher (10 intervals for 5 seconds each) and 3 minutes for each of the 6 students (10 intervals for 3 seconds each).

In short, this cross-lab collaboration involves many hours of planning and development. Several meetings were held to discuss and revise data collection strategies and instruments. Preliminary analyses were circulated and inputs were provided by participating lab researchers. This study is not only an unprecedented effort on the part of the labs to conduct, it also makes a timely contribution to the national discussion on improving Title I.

Notes

1. Each scale is made of relevant items from the questionnaire (the reason why we use indicators rather than individual questions for analysis is that a composite indicator is much more stable and reliable). For example, the student performance goal includes 13 items from the teacher questionnaire. These 13 questions were selected due to the conceptual basis and empirical factor analysis results. Also, Cronbach's alpha (inter-item reliability, a commonly used statistical method) indicates this scale is reliable (.88). Examples of the 13 questions are: "My school has clearly articulated performance goals for all students for reading, math, etc."; "My school places a high priority on learning"; "I demonstrate support of my school's goals for student performance." It is better to use the scale, rather than individual questions, to represent concepts such as student performance goal and accountability.
2. Each question in the teacher questionnaire includes the 5 Likert scale for the responses: 'strongly disagree', 'disagree', 'uncertain', 'agree', 'strongly agree'. Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each scale to check if each scale included questions that go together (if a scale has low alpha, it means that the scale includes questions that don't belong together and needs to be adjusted). The range of the reliabilities for all the scales is .63 to .88 and the mean is .80.

Authors

Margaret C. Wang is a Professor of Educational Psychology and the founder and current Director of the Center for Research in Human Development and Education (CRHDE) at Temple University. Dr. Wang also serves as the Executive Director of the Mid-Atlantic Laboratory for Student Success, one of the U. S. Department of Education's Regional Educational Laboratories, and the National Center on Education in the Inner Cities (CEIC), an interdisciplinary National Research and Development Center established by funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education.

Contact information:

Temple University
Center for Research in Human Development and Education
1301 Cecil B. Moore Ave, 933 Ritter Annex
Philadelphia, PA 19122
Phone: (215) 204-3001
Email: mcw@vm.temple.edu

Kenneth K. Wong is an Associate Professor in the Department of Education and the College at the University of Chicago. A political scientist by training, he has conducted research in urban school reform, state finance and educational policies, intergovernmental relations, and federal educational policies (Title I). He has authored and/or edited four books and serves as a member of the editorial board in several professional journals. In 1989-90 he was awarded the Spencer Fellowship from the National Academy of Education.

Contact information:

Department of Education
University of Chicago
5835 Kimbark Avenue
Chicago, IL 60637
Phone: (773) 702-0753
Email: stdwong@cicero.spc.uchicago.edu